



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RAILROAD COMPANIES—CHANGE OF GRADE—LIABILITY TO ABUTTING OWNERS.—Prior to 1892, defendant railroad company had acquired as against abutting owners, the right to maintain its road along an avenue in New York city through a subway. In 1892 the legislature passed an act compelling defendant to operate its road upon a steel viaduct elevated above the ground, thus giving the public the use of the whole of the surface of the street, which before was impossible. This improvement was made by the state under the direction of an independent board, which was appointed by the mayor of New York under the authority of this statute. The act further provided that the expense should be borne by the city and this defendant in equal proportions. Plaintiff, the owner of abutting property, sues for damages sustained by reason of the interference with his easements of light, air and access, by the erection of this viaduct upon which defendant's trains are now being run. *Held*, that the railroad company was not liable. *Muhlker v. New York & Harlem Railroad Company* (1903), — N. Y. —, 66 N. E. Rep. 558.

The court, admitting the injury to the plaintiff, takes the ground that the defendant is not liable because it had no alternative but to obey the command of the statute and use the viaduct erected by the state. On principle, the doctrine thus laid down would seem to be opposed to that laid down in the recent case of *McKeon v. N. Y., N. H. & H. R. Co.*, — Conn. —, 53 Atl. Rep. 656, where the court said that the "liability is not removed because defendant was compelled to make the changes which involved the damage to the plaintiff's property." See I MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW, 524. In the present case a strong dissenting opinion was rendered by Bartlett, J., in which Cullen, J., concurred.

RES JUDICATA—GARNISHMENT IN FOREIGN JURISDICTION AS A DEFENSE.—Defendant operated a line of railway extending through several states and was indebted to plaintiff on contract for services rendered. To an action for the amount, defendant pleaded a judgment against it for the same demand in garnishment proceedings in a foreign jurisdiction. *Held*, that such plea was no defense to the action. *Bailey v. Pennsylvania Ry. Co.* (1903), — N. J. Law, —, 54 Atl. Rep. 248.

It is a well settled rule that the pendency of an ordinary suit between the same parties for the same cause of action in a foreign jurisdiction is no bar to a second action. *Stanton v. Embrey*, 93 U. S. 548; *Hatch v. Spofford*, 22 Conn. 497, 58 Am. Dec. 433; *Imlay v. Ellepen*, 2 East, 457. But by the weight of authority, there is an exception to the above rule in the case of garnishment proceedings and a plea of prior garnishment in a foreign jurisdiction is a good defense. *Hanna v. Embree*, 5 Johns. 101; *Bowne v. Joy*, 9 Johns. 220; *Harvey v. Gt. No. Ry.*, 50 Minn. 405, 52 N. W. Rep. 905; *Baltimore & Ohio Ry. Co. v. May*, 25 Ohio St. 347; *Mattingly v. Boyd*, 20 Howard 128; *Rood on GARNISHMENTS*, sec. 201. The principal case seems to have been decided upon the authority of *Kerr v. Willets*, 48 N. J. Law 78, 2 Atl. Rep. 782, which did not involve a foreign garnishment, and would, therefore, fall under the general rule.

SALES—AGENCY AND CONDITIONAL SALE DISTINGUISHED.—Appellant wrote to a retailer to whom he had been selling but whose credit had become bad, that he could not sell him goods "outright," but would consign to him furs "which you agree to handle for my account and hold proceeds in trust making settlement within 30, 60, or 90 days—as soon as the money may be collected"—which offer was accepted and the furs shipped. They were later levied upon by the retailer's creditors. In an action on the replevin bond